

Robert A. Julian (SBN 88469)
Cecily A. Dumas (SBN 111449)
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
1160 Battery Street, Suite 100
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 628.208.6434
Facsimile: 310.820.8859
Email: rjulian@bakerlaw.com
Email: cdumas@bakerlaw.com

Eric E. Sagerman (SBN 155496)
Lauren T. Attard (SBN 320898)
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
11601 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90025-0509
Telephone: 310.820.8800
Facsimile: 310.820.8859
Email: esagerman@bakerlaw.com
Email: lattard@bakerlaw.com

Counsel to the Official Committee of Tort Claimants

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

In re:

PG&E CORPORATION

-and-

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC
COMPANY,**

Debtors.

- ☐ Affects PG&E Corporation
- ☐ Affects Pacific Gas and Electric Company
- ☒ Affects both Debtors

**All papers shall be filed in the Lead Case,
No. 19-30088 (DM)*

Bankruptcy Case
No. 19-30088 (DM)

Chapter 11
(Lead Case)
(Jointly Administered)

**OBJECTION BY THE OFFICIAL
COMMITTEE OF TORT CLAIMANTS TO
APPLICATION PURSUANT TO 11 U.S.C. §
327(e) AND FED. R. BANKR. P. 2014(a) AND
2016 FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING THE
DEBTORS TO RETAIN COBLENTZ
PATCH DUFFY & BASS LLP AS SPECIAL
COUNSEL *NUNC PRO TUNC* TO THE
PETITION DATE (DKT. NO. 2595)**

Date: July 9, 2019
Time: 9:30 a.m. (Pacific Time)
Place: United States Bankruptcy Court
Courtroom 17, 16th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

Objection Deadline: July 2, 2019

1 The Official Committee of Tort Claimants (the “TCC”), one of the largest stakeholders in
2 the bankruptcy cases of PG&E Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company, (collectively,
3 the “Debtors”), by and through their proposed undersigned counsel, hereby files this objection and
4 reservation of rights (the “**Objection**”) to the Application Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 327(e) and Fed.
5 R. Bankr. P. 2014(a) and 2016 for Order Authorizing the Debtors to Retain Coblenz Patch Duffy
6 & Bass LLP as Special Counsel *Nunc Pro Tunc* to the Petition Date (the “**Motion**”) (Doc. No.
7 2595). In support of this Objection, the TCC respectfully states as follows:

8 **OBJECTION**

9 1. The TCC objects to the Motion based on Coblenz Patch Duffy & Bass LLP’s
10 (“Coblenz”) past and current representation of the City of Oakland in *Gregory v. Chor Nar Siu*
11 *Ng*, Case No. RG 16843631 (“**Ghost Ship Fire Case**”), which is a conflict of interest. Coblenz is
12 the lead counsel for the City of Oakland in the Ghost Ship Fire Case. Pacific Gas and Electric
13 Company (“**PG&E**”) is a co-defendant in the Ghost Ship Fire Case and is represented by different
14 counsel. With regard to PG&E, the matter is stayed, but PG&E is a co-tortfeasor under Proposition
15 51. Coblenz has also obtained non-public information regarding two members of the TCC in the
16 Ghost Ship Fire Case, Susan Slocum and Samuel Maxwell¹.

17 2. The TCC objects because the Motion states that Coblenz currently has a
18 relationship with one of the professional consultants to the TCC, Lincoln Partners Advisors LLC
19 (“**Lincoln**”), which relationship the Motion lists as an “Affiliate or Subsidiary of Former and
20 Current Client.” Motion, p. 22, Exhibit B. Lincoln is one of the financial advisors of the TCC and
21 is actively engaged in advising the TCC on financial matters involving the Debtors.

22 3. While the Motion indicates that the Debtors anticipate that much of the work
23 Coblenz will perform involves regulatory matters, the Motion is vague enough to encompass work
24 on the Ghost Ship Fire. Indeed, the Motion states in part that “Coblenz will also perform other
25 legal services as requested by the Debtors during the pendency of their Chapter 11 Cases, to the

26 ¹ Coblenz represents a member of the TCC, Wagner Family Wines-Caymus Vineyards (“**Caymus Vineyards**”). To
27 represent the Debtors and a member of the TCC at the same time may be a conflict of interest. Baker & Hostetler LLP
28 does not represent Caymus Vineyards in its individual capacity, and neither asserts nor waives any privilege on Caymus
Vineyards’ behalf.

1 extent Coblentz agrees to perform such work.” Motion at pps. 7-8. The TCC submits that the
2 Debtors should clarify the scope of Coblentz’s engagement so that interested parties have a greater
3 understanding of the work Coblentz will perform as special counsel.

4 4. The Motion is also silent about the potential use of information obtained through the
5 Ghost Ship Fire Case. Accordingly, if the Court is inclined to grant the Motion, the TCC
6 respectfully requests that the Court condition any order on precluding Coblentz (1) from
7 representing the Debtors on matters relating to the Ghost Ship Fire, claims estimation or the claims
8 process, and (2) sharing with the Debtors any information Coblentz learned or learns as counsel to
9 City of Oakland that was not in the Debtors’ possession, custody or control as of the Petition Date.

10 5. The TCC reserves its right to join in any other opposition or response to the Motion
11 and to amend or supplement this Objection.

12 WHEREFORE, the TCC requests that the Court sustain the TCC’s limited Objection and
13 require the Debtors and Coblentz to satisfy the conditions described above, and grant such other
14 relief as is just.

15 Dated: July 2, 2019

16
17 BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

18 By: /s/ Lauren Attard
Lauren Attard

19 *Counsel to the Official Committee of Tort*
20 *Claimants*